



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

single copy of it in Germany. There is a copy of it in the British Museum (press-mark: Ac 8247 2), and while in London some three years ago, I began copying it with a view of comparing it with the other extant plays on the same subject, but as my time was very limited, and as the play turned out to be much longer than I had expected (about 1250 lines), I could copy only a very small portion of it, not including the part Prof. Davidson refers to.

I compared, however, the whole play with the corresponding two plays, xviii ("Purification") and xx ("Christ Disputing in the Temple,"), of the 'Ludus Coventriae'—of which the Weavers' play does not form a part—and can say that they are entirely independent of one another.

If on the other hand, as Prof. Davidson has found, parts of the Weavers' play agree with parts of the twentieth York play, the question as to their mutual relation may easily become more complicated than it might seem to be at first sight; for some portions of the York play occur almost word for word in the corresponding plays, both of the Towneley and of the Chester collections, as I have shown in *Anglia*, vol. xi, p. 260 ff. In case these parts should happen to be the same as the "sixteen stanzas of the York play," mentioned by Prof. Davidson, there would be no less than four parallel versions of the same original play or part of a play; and even if we take it for granted that the York play in its primitive form was the original version, the question remains to be answered whether the other three were directly taken from the York play, or partly from each other.

Furthermore, in carefully reading the Weavers' play, my attention was especially attracted, in the part preceding the "Presentation in the Temple" proper, by two scenes between Mary and Joseph, very similar to each other. Both of these scenes represent husband and wife as indulging in one of those conjugal quarrels so common on the medieval stage, and in both instances Joseph addresses the audience, complaining of the trials of married life and pronouncing happy those that have been wise enough to remain single. These scenes seemed to me, at the time, to agree very closely with a similar one in one of the plays of either

York, Chester, or Towneley, but I was unable to carry the investigation any further, and am now not in possession of all the necessary material for taking it up again.

In short, it seems to me that the relations of the Weavers' play to the twentieth York play, and possibly to the other plays on the same subject (with exception, however, of Coventry xviii and xx), are important enough to warrant a more detailed investigation; while on the other hand, the interesting notice of Prof. Davidson will be of but little profit to most scholars, unless at least the corresponding parts of the two plays be printed. My object then in writing these lines is to call attention to these two circumstances, and I hope that either Prof. Davidson or some one else who has access to the Abbotsford Club print of the Weavers' play, will soon give us the needed details.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

ANGLO-SAXON PHONOLOGY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—Permit me a few words suggested by the remarks of Professor Hempl in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251. It is well known that initial *h* was very weak in the North, and so might not possess consonantal value when brought into the medial position as proposed. But how much stronger was it in Mercian?

Compare with the list given by Bouterwek (p. cxl), and with Lindelöf ('Sprache d. Rit. v. Durham,' §44; s. also the *Nation*, lii, 72) the following words which occur in R¹:

Initial *h* is wanting in: *is* (ejus) 7. 24; 22. 24; 24. 46; *us* 17. 25; *eard* 25. 24; *eorta* 6. 21; *-um* 18. 35; *eora* 6. 15 etc. (9); *eo* (hëo) 16. 18; *æfdon* 8. 33; *æfð* 13. 12; (cf. *æbbe*, Charters 48. 19); *ge-yrdon* 19. 25; *yngrade* 25. 35; (of less significance, the foreign words *erodes* 2. 1; *ymne* 26. 30).

Inorganic *h* appears in: *heow* (vobis) 6. 14; *hōehtnisse* 5. 10 *hoehtende* 5. 12; *hehtende* 5. 11; *his* (est) 3. 3; 5. 3; 17. 4; 22. 20; *hoð* 5. 34. 36; *a-e* 26. 72; *-as* 5. 33; *hefalsap* 9. 3; *-adum* 27. 39; *hefalsunge* 15. 19. I omit, as less important, the frequent cases where *h* is inorganic, or wanting, before consonants. For the 'V. Ps.,' cf. Zeuner, p. 84; for 'Corpus,' Dieter, p. 66.

Now strong medial or final *h* did not always effect *eo* in Mercian. Shall it be assumed, then, that weak initial *h*, brought into the medial position, changed *eo* to *e* persistently in the case in question?

A careful statistical analysis of the language of the "Durham Book" is still wanting, and we cannot speak with certainty about it. But it passes for an independent dialect. Are we at liberty, therefore, to speak of doublets in such a dialect as "no stranger" than in a dialect known to be mixed, like that of Chaucer, still less modern English?

Again *geoc* should not be adduced to show the probability of *geo-* forms (from *ju-*) in the North since it represents W.Gc. *jō-* (cf. Sievers, §74; Cosijn, p. 70). It has gone a different road from *ging*, *gigod̥*. Yet even in this very word the tendency against "palatal influence" in North. and Merc. may be plainly seen. The Durham Rit. has *iocce* (cf. Lindelöf, p. 24), and R₁ has only *ioc* 11. 29. 30.

The only remains of Old North. that we possess, aside from a few inscriptions, are the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual. If no genuine case of *geo-* (= *ju-*) can be found in these texts, it can only be assumed without evidence that such forms existed. The special peculiarity for North. is *gi-* (= *ju-*), cf. *gigod̥* etc., a change which Lindelöf confesses is not clear to him. On the other hand, Mercian keeps *iu-*, *gu-* unchanged (cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, vii, 251). This appears to be a characteristic difference in dialect.

EDWARD M. BROWN.

University of Cincinnati.

FURTHER NOTES TO PARIS'S 'EXTRAITS DE LA CHANSON DE ROLAND.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—To Professor Sheldon's article entitled "A Few Notes on Old French Phonology" in the March number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, I venture to add a statement of some of the difficulties encountered by the student in the use of Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland.'

In the 'avertissement' we are told that

"Un exercice très utile pour les étudiants sera de contrôler toutes les étymologies et d'expliquer toutes les formes qui s'y trouvent à l'aide des règles de phonétique et de flexion données dans les observations grammaticales."

The author's plan of tracing the phonetic changes backward from the French form to the Latin, involves the disadvantage of leaving unexplained those sounds in the Latin etymon that have disappeared in the course of development. While the student may find an explanation of all the sounds in *paiens*, *chedables* and *quinze*, he is compelled to consult other treatises in order to learn under what conditions the *g* in PAGANUS, the *ð* in *CATABOLUM, and the *d* in QUINDECIM have disappeared. A few pages devoted to general rules for the development of the word from the Latin starting-point, would satisfy what seems to be a real need.

In the table of the "Valeur phonétique des caractères employés," we find:

ð.—*o* ouvert ou bref (*sotte*, *port*).

ó.—*o* fermé ou long (*sot*, *côte*).

In the examples here given, the *o* of *port*, on the contrary, is *ouvert long*, and that of *sot* is at least not *fermé long* (it is "*fermé moyen*" in the "Tableau figuratif" of the new French dictionary of Darmesteter and Hatzfeld, p. xxvi).—According to §9, ILLAC would give *lai*, but *la* is the form occurring in the text (ll. 16, 24, 168).—The nom. pl. of the definite article *li* (ILLI) is explained in §18, but the exceptional development of the nom. sing. *li* is not.—In §27 *guascoigne* and *guascoing* are cited as examples of the formation of the diphthong *ói* from *o*, while in §55 *ign* and *ing* (final) are noted as the graphic representations of *ñ*.—It is stated in §28 that the diphthong *ou* "provient de *ō*, ù plus *u* (*lou*, *dous*, *dessoure*)," but in the case of *dessoure*, in which *soure* comes from *soure* (*sobra*, *sopra*), neither the development of *v* from *p* (cf. §42), nor that of *u* from *v* (cf. §29) is given.—The statement in §52 that Latin *rr* persists does not apply to *rr*, become final: *turris*, *tors*, l. 3 (see Bourciez, 'Phonétique française' §§171, 1 and 172, 1).—In the case of *quinze* (§56, l. 6) a reference to §46, l. 10 (*z*=voiced *s*) would be of assistance.—The rule for *dz* from *d* medial + *j* (VIRIDIARIUM, *vergier*) is omitted in §58.—It is nowhere